

Last night, we watched President Obama say farewell to the country he served. For the past 8 years, parts of our country disparaged him, and some of our colleagues fought him tooth and nail at the expense of their constituents; but, each day, we were assured that our outgoing President put this country and our interests first.

President-elect Trump seems to serve himself. Yesterday, several news sources reported the possibility of a continuing exchange of information between Russia and Trump campaign officials during the election; so, in the face of yet another troubling revelation that further sullies the ground on which his loyalty to America stands, I have questions:

Is our President-elect willing to sacrifice his personal gain for the good of this great Nation?

When will we find out if he has fulfilled his legal obligation to pay taxes like millions of Americans do?

How can we be sure that our interests will take precedence if we don't even know that they ever have?

Will this White House serve as "Trump Tower South"?

The actions and words of the President of the United States have a loud and reverberating effect through the world economy and the international political system.

To date, President-elect Trump's promises to America have been hollow and his actions self-serving. President-elect Donald Trump does not merely offer an alternative direction for our Nation; he, it seems, offers to use the Presidency primarily for his personal benefit.

When given an opportunity to set these concerns aside, he scoffs at his critics and embraces our Nation's enemies. Instead of making reasonable attempts to reassure the American public, whom he will soon swear to protect, he gaslights us with tweets, mockery, and lies.

In the past, we have seen the term "un-American" used to indict members of the public executing their civil liberties. Antiwar advocates protesting for peace have been called un-American. Civil rights leaders standing against discrimination have been called un-American—just ask Senator JEFF SESSIONS. Professional athletes taking a knee to acknowledge sordid realities within our justice system are deemed un-American, and comedians and pastors, alike, for using their microphones to criticize our Nation.

But, quite frankly, dissent is American; protest is American; criticism is American. Healthy skepticism toward our national intelligence is American. Disparaging and discrediting it is not.

Working with foreign powers to ensure peace is not only American, but also Presidential; inviting a foreign power to compromise the cybersecurity of private citizens is not.

Empowering Americans to become involved in the political process, to take action, and to even be critical of

you is American; attacking them when they call untruths and inciting your supporters to do the same is not.

For these reasons and a host of others, I simply ask the question: At what point do the actions of our next President—President-elect Donald Trump—meet that threshold of un-American?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President-elect.

#### U.N. RESOLUTION 2334

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, U.N. Resolution 2334 was an anti-Israel resolution that sought to erase the history of the Jewish people and their connection to their historic homeland.

Under U.N. Resolution 2334, the Western Wall, which is the holiest site in Judaism and the last remnant of the Second Temple, is considered occupied territory. You can't even make this up. I think it is important to point out that the territory at issue, which we are talking about, including the West Bank, which is historic Judea and Samaria—some of the oldest Jewish lands dating back thousands of years—is disputed. It is not occupied territory.

When you use that term for things like the Western Wall, you show that all you are trying to do is to harm and attack the State of Israel but not do this in an intellectually honest way. If you look at the Balfour Declaration, that entire mandate was originally for a Jewish state, including what is now Jordan.

As we got into the 1920s, Britain thought that giving what was called Transjordan—what is considered to be the eastern part of Palestine—would be a reward for the help of some of the Arabs during the First World War. That had been under Turkish control for hundreds of years before World War I. It was then under British control. You have this British mandate, and they eventually give Jordan everything east of the river; but then Jewish Palestine—this is a Jewish state, which is all of Israel proper: Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria, you name it—was what Britain wanted to do. The League of Nations in 1922, which is the last legally binding document, recognized that as well.

Fast-forward past World War II and we get into the late forties. The Arabs always rejected having a state shared with Israel in that respect. Then we get to 1948 and the U.N. Partition Plan. How much measly less territory for Israel? It is really an indefensible country. There is a massive Arab state there; yet Israel accepted even these little crumbs of territory. What did the Arabs do? They rejected having a state. You had invasions against Israel from all sides, and the goal was the annihilation of the Jewish state in 1948.

Between '48 and '67—we always heard about these 1967 lines. Those are not

political lines. Those are armistice lines. Israel won the war for their independence. They beat back the Arab armies. You had Egypt controlling the Gaza Strip and you had Jordan controlling Judea and Samaria, what we know as the West Bank.

□ 1100

So those were armistice lines, never internationally recognized. Jordan's occupation of the West Bank was not recognized internationally.

When Arafat founded the PLO, it was in 1964, '65, when you still had these armistice lines. So the Palestine Liberation Organization, what are they trying to liberate Palestine from? He is not talking about the West Bank. He is talking about Israel proper. He wanted to push the Jews to the sea.

So why would we be rewarding? Palestinian Arabs rejected a state in '48. They rejected a generous offer in 2000, 2007. Every time, they have chosen to go to war with Israel, and they are more opposed to a Jewish state than they are interested in their own state.

We do have an example, though. What happens? You talk about Israel occupation. They don't occupy the Gaza Strip. What is the Gaza Strip? Is this like a nice la-la land on the Mediterranean? No. It is a terror state controlled by Hamas, and they launch incessant rocket attacks against Israel.

So a Palestinian state in this area, Judea-Samaria—West Bank—would be what they call *judenrein*. It would be free of Jews. They would ethnically cleanse every Jew who was in anything considered earmarked for Palestinian Arabs. It is an interesting contrast, because in Israel, Arab Israelis live and prosper, and they are treated as equal citizens.

So we have to get this straight. What the U.N. did was totally unacceptable. This body needs to remove funding for the U.N. until they repeal that offending resolution, and the new administration needs to move our embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem in a show of solidarity with our friends in Israel.

#### ACA REPEAL AND DELAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans' plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act should be entitled repeal and collapse, because it will generate, in this country, a financial and healthcare meltdown for tens of millions of people.

In fact, if we repeal the ACA, 30 million Americans will lose their health insurance. States and hospitals will be on the hook for \$1.1 trillion in uncompensated care, and rural hospitals will close.

It will cost the country 3 million jobs. All of this is to give the top one half of 1 percent an almost \$200,000 tax break and costs middle class families as much as \$6,000 more a year. Once